arXiv:1404.5070v2 [math.NT] 21 Aug 2014

Congruences involving product of intervals and sets with small multiplicative doubling modulo a prime and applications

J. Cilleruelo and M. Z. Garaev

Abstract

In the present paper we obtain new upper bound estimates for the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x \equiv yr \pmod p; \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x, y \le H, \quad r \in \mathcal{U},$$

for certain ranges of H and $|\mathcal{U}|$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a subset of the field of residue classes modulo p having small multiplicative doubling. We then use this estimate to show that the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x^n \equiv \lambda \pmod p; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad L < x < L + p/n,$$

is at most $p^{\frac{1}{3}-c}$ uniformly over positive integers n, λ and L, for some absolute constant $c > 0$. This implies, in particular, that if $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is a fixed polynomial without multiple roots in $\mathbb{C}$, then the congruence $x^{f(x)} \equiv 1 \pmod p$, $x \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \le p$, has at most $p^{\frac{1}{3}-c}$ solutions as $p \to \infty$, improving some recent results of Kurlberg, Luca and Shparlinski and of Balog, Broughan and Shparlinski. We use our results to show that almost all the residue classes modulo p can be represented in the form $xg^y \pmod p$ with positive integers $x < p^{5/8+\varepsilon}$ and $y < p^{3/8}$. Here g denotes a primitive root modulo p. We also prove that almost all the residue classes modulo p can be represented in the form $xyzg^t \pmod p$ with positive integers $x, y, z, t < p^{1/4+\varepsilon}$.

1 Introduction

In what follows, ε is a small fixed positive quantity, $\mathbb{F}_p$ is the field of residue classes modulo a prime number p, which we consider to be sufficiently large

in terms of ε. The notation $A \lesssim B$ is used to denote that $|A| < |B|p^{o(1)}$, or equivalently, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a constant $c = c(\varepsilon)$ such that $|A| < c|B|p^{\varepsilon}$. Given sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ their product-set $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{B} = \{ab; \quad a \in \mathcal{A},\, b \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

The distributional properties of powers of a primitive root modulo p and subgroups of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ has a long story, starting from the work of Vinogradov [22] in 1926. A substantial amount of information and results can be found in the book of Konyagin and Shparlinski [16]. In the present paper we continue the investigation on this topic. Our first result is closely related to the work of Bourgain, Konyagin and Shparlisnki [3] and to some results of Konyagin and Shparlinski from [16].

Theorem 1. *Let H be a positive integer and let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be such that*

$$|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|.$$

Denote by J the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x \equiv yr \pmod p; \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x, y \le H, \quad r \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{1}$$

Then the following two assertions hold:

(i). If for some positive integer constant n we have

$$|\mathcal{U}| < p^{n/(2n+1)}, \quad |\mathcal{U}|H^n < p,$$

then $J \lesssim H$.

(ii). If $|\mathcal{U}| < p^{2/5}$, then

$$J \lesssim H + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|H^2}{p} + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{3/4}H}{p^{1/4}}.$$

Corollary 1. *Let H be a positive integer and let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be such that*

$$|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|.$$

Denote by J the number of solutions of the congruence

$$xr \equiv x_1 r_1 \pmod p; \quad x, x_1 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x, x_1 \le H, \quad r, r_1 \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{2}$$

Then the following two assertions hold:

(i). If for some positive integer constant n we have

$$|\mathcal{U}| < p^{n/(2n+1)}, \qquad |\mathcal{U}|H^n < p,$$

then $J \lesssim H|\mathcal{U}|$.

(ii). If

$$p^{1/3} < |\mathcal{U}| < p^{2/5}, \qquad |\mathcal{U}|H < p,$$

then

$$J \lesssim \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{7/4}H}{p^{1/4}}.$$

We remark that in the case $\mathcal{U}$ is a subgroup and $n = 1$ the statement of the part (i) of our Theorem 1 follows from Corollary 7.7 of the aforementioned book [16].

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on ideas and results of Bourgain, Konyagin and Shparlinski [3]. Nevertheless, in the indicated range of parameters, the upper bound estimate of our Theorem 1 improves one of the main results of [3].

We give several new applications of Theorem 1. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and λ be an integer coprime to p. For real numbers L and $N \geq 1$, consider the problem of upper bound estimates for the number $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N)$ of solutions of the congruence

$$x^d \equiv \lambda \pmod{p}; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad L + 1 \leq x \leq L + N. \tag{3}$$

Trivially, for $N < p$, we have the bound $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) \leq \min\{d, N\}$. The problem of obtaining nontrivial upper bounds for $T(d, \lambda, L, N)$ is of a very high interest, with a variety of results in the literature, see, for example, the aforementioned work [3], and more recent work of Shkredov [20]. Several nontrivial results can also be derived using the arguments from [4]. For instance, it is possible to prove that if $N < p^{2/5}$, then one has the bound $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) \lesssim d^{1/2}$. Using our Theorem 1 we shall obtain the following new result on $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N)$ for any range d, N with $dN < p$.

Theorem 2. *There exists an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$T_p(d, \lambda, L, p/d) < p^{\frac{1}{3}-c}.$$

From Theorem 2 we can derive the following consequence.

Corollary 2. *Let $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a fixed non-constant polynomial without multiple roots in $\mathbb{C}$. Then the congruence*

$$x^{f(x)} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x \le p, \tag{4}$$

has at most $p^{\frac{1}{3}-c}$ solutions as $p \to \infty$, for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

Corollary 2 improves the upper bound of the size $p^{6/13+o(1)}$ obtained by Kurlberg, Luca and Shparlinski [17]. We remark that the upper bound of the size $p^{1/3+o(1)}$ was known in the particular case $f(x) = x$ from the work of Balog, Broughan and Shparlinski [1]. Our result improves this too.

The constant c in Theorem 2 and Corollary 2 can easily be made explicit. In the special case $f(x) = x$, using a different approach, in Corollary 2 we can obtain the upper bound of the size $p^{27/82+o(1)}$. We hope to deal with these questions elsewhere.

We shall give two more applications of Theorem 1. Let

$$\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, H\} \pmod{p}$$

be an interval of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $|\mathcal{I}| = H$ elements. Denote by $\mathcal{G}$ either a subgroup of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ or the set

$$\{1, g, g^2, \ldots, g^{N-1}\} \pmod{p}$$

with $|\mathcal{G}| = N$ elements, formed with powers of a primitive root g modulo p.

Theorem 3. *For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{5/8+\varepsilon}$, $|\mathcal{G}| > p^{3/8}$, then*

$$|\mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{G}| = p + O(p^{1-\delta})$$

for some $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$.

Theorem 4. *For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{1/4+\varepsilon}$, $|\mathcal{G}| > p^{1/4}$, then*

$$|\mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{G}| = p + O(p^{1-\delta})$$

for some $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$.

Let us mention several results relevant to Theorems 3, 4. In [11] it was shown that if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{\frac{2}{3}-\frac{1}{192}+\varepsilon}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $|\mathcal{A}| > p^{\frac{2}{3}-\frac{1}{192}+\varepsilon}$ then

$$|\mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{A}| = p + O(p^{1-\delta}); \quad \delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0.$$

Later, the exponent $\frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{192}$ was improved by Bourgain to $\frac{5}{8}$ (unpublished). We also mention that if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{1/2+\varepsilon}$, then one has

$$|\mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I}| = p + O(p^{1-\delta}); \quad \delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0,$$

see, for example, [12].

Theorem 3 and its proof imply that if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{5/8+\varepsilon}$, $|\mathcal{G}| > p^{3/8}$, then

$$\mathbb{F}_p^* \subset \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{G}.$$

We remark that from the arguments of Heath-Brown [13] it follows that if $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{5/8+\varepsilon}$, then one has

$$\mathbb{F}_p^* \subset \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I}.$$

Theorem 4 can be compared with the result from [10], where it was shown that under the same condition $|\mathcal{I}| > p^{1/4+\varepsilon}$ one has

$$|\mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{I}| = p + O(p^{1-\delta}); \quad \delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0.$$

However, the presence of $\mathcal{G}$ in our theorems is an additional obstacle which we are able to overcome using Theorem 1.

Theorem 4 implies, in particular, that any $\lambda \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$ can be represented in the form

$$\lambda \equiv xyzuvwg^t \pmod p$$

for some positive integers $x, y, z, t, u, v, w < p^{1/4+\varepsilon}$.

In passing, we remark that in Theorem 1 the condition $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|$ can be relaxed up to $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < |\mathcal{U}|p^{o(1)}$. However, the formulation in the form $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|$ already applies for the set $\mathcal{G}$ and is sufficient to prove Theorems 2, 3, 4.

In what follows χ denotes a character modulo the prime number p and χ_0 denotes the principal character.

2 Auxiliary Lemmas

We start with the following lemma of Bourgain, Konyagin and Shparlinski [3], see also [7] for a different proof with refined constants.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{F}_Q$, where*

$$\mathcal{F}_Q = \left\{\frac{r}{s};\ r, s \in \mathbb{N},\ \gcd(r, s) = 1,\ r, s \le Q\right\}$$

is the set of Farey fractions of order Q. Then for a given positive integer m, the m-fold product set $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$|\mathcal{A}^{(m)}| > \exp\Big(-C(m)\frac{\log Q}{\sqrt{\log\log Q}}\Big)|\mathcal{A}|^m,$$

where $C(m) > 0$ depends only on m, provided that Q is large enough.

We recall that the m-fold product set $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}^{(m)} = \{a_1 \cdots a_m; \quad a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Our next lemma stems from the work of Bourgain et. al. [4]. Recall that a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$ generated by n linearly independent vectors. Take an arbitrary convex compact and symmetric with respect to 0 body $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Recall that, for a lattice $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the i-th successive minimum $\lambda_i(D, \Gamma)$ of the set D with respect to the lattice Γ is defined as the minimal number λ such that the set λD contains i linearly independent vectors of the lattice Γ. Obviously, $\lambda_1(D, \Gamma) \le \ldots \le \lambda_n(D, \Gamma)$. From [2, Proposition 2.1] it is known that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{\lambda_i(D, \Gamma), 1\} \le \frac{(2n+1)!!}{|D \cap \Gamma|}. \tag{5}$$

Lemma 2. *For any $s_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, the number of solutions of the congruence*

$$x \equiv s_0 y \pmod p; \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x \le X, \quad y \le Y, \quad \gcd(x, y) = 1, \tag{6}$$

is bounded by $O(1 + XYp^{-1})$.

Proof. Consider the lattice

$$\Gamma = \{(u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2; \quad u \equiv s_0 v \pmod p\}$$

and the body

$$D = \{(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2; \quad |u| \le X, \ |v| \le Y\}.$$

Let λ_1, λ_2 be the consecutive minimas of the body D with respect to the lattice Γ. If $\lambda_2 > 1$ then there is at most one independent vector in $\Gamma \cap D$, implying that $J \le 1$, where J is the number of solutions of (6).

Let now $\lambda_2 \le 1$. Then, by (5), we get

$$\lambda_1\lambda_2 \le \frac{15}{|\Gamma \cap D|} \le \frac{15}{J}.$$

Let $(u_i, v_i) \in \lambda_i D \cap \Gamma$, $i = 1, 2$, be linearly independent. Then

$$0 \ne \det \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_1 \\ u_2 & v_2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Therefore,

$$p \le \left|\det \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_1 \\ u_2 & v_2 \end{pmatrix}\right| = |u_1v_2 - u_2v_1| \le 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 XY \le \frac{30XY}{J}$$

and the result follows.

□

We also need the following simple lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let X, Y be positive numbers with $XY < p$. Then for any λ there is at most one solution to the congruence*

$$\frac{x}{y} \equiv \lambda \pmod{p}; \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x \le X,\ y \le Y, \quad \gcd(x, y) = 1.$$

Proof. Assuming that there is at least one solution (x_0, y_0), we get that

$$xy_0 \equiv x_0y \pmod{p},$$

and since the both hand sides are not greater than $XY < p$, the congruence is converted to an equality, which together with $\gcd(x, y) = \gcd(x_0, y_0) = 1$ implies that $x = x_0$, $y = y_0$. □

To prove our Theorem 2, we shall need the following lemma, which can be found in [18, Chapter 1, Theorem 1].

Lemma 4. *Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ be a sequence of d points of the unit interval $[0, 1]$. Then for any integer $K \ge 1$, and an interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subseteq [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\#\{n = 1, \dots, d\ : \gamma_n \in [\alpha, \beta]\} - d(\beta - \alpha) \\ \ll \frac{d}{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\frac{1}{K} + \min\{\beta - \alpha, 1/k\}\right) \left|\sum_{n=1}^{d} \exp(2\pi i k\gamma_n)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

We shall also need the well-known character sum bounds of Burgess [5, 6].

Lemma 5. *For any fixed positive integer constant r the following bound holds:*

$$\max_{\chi \neq \chi_0} \Big| \sum_{n=L+1}^{L+N} \chi(n) \Big| < N^{1-\frac{1}{r}} p^{\frac{r+1}{4r^2}+o(1)}.$$

We also recall the following bound of exponential sum estimates over subgroups due to Konyagin [15].

Lemma 6. *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a subgroup of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ with $|\mathcal{G}| < p^{1/2}$ then*

$$\max_{a \not\equiv 0 (\bmod p)} \Big| \sum_{x \in G} e_p(ax) \Big| \ll |G|^{29/36} p^{1/18}.$$

Here and below we use the abbreviation $e_p(z) = e^{2\pi i z/p}$. Lemma 6 will be used in the proof of Theorem 2. We recall that a better bound follows from the work of Shteinikov [21], but since in Theorem 2 we do not specify the constant c, for our current purposes Lemma 6 suffices.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Given a positive integer d we let $J_d(H, \mathcal{U})$ be the number of solutions of (1) with the additional condition $\gcd(x, y) = d$. Then we have

$$J = \sum_{d \le H} J_d(H, \mathcal{U}) = \sum_{d \le H} J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}). \tag{7}$$

Since each pair of relatively prime positive integers (x, y) can be defined by the rational number x/y, it follows that $J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U})$ is equal to the cardinality of the set

$$\mathcal{J}_d = \Big\{ \frac{x}{y}; \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N},\, x, y \le \frac{H}{d},\, \gcd(x, y) = 1,\, \frac{x}{y} \pmod p \in \mathcal{U} \Big\}.$$

We observe that the m-fold product set $\mathcal{J}_d^{(m)}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{J}_d^{(m)} \subset \Big\{ \frac{u}{v}; \quad u, v \in \mathbb{N},\, u, v \le (H/d)^m,\, \gcd(u, v) = 1,\, \frac{u}{v} \pmod p \in \mathcal{U}^{(m)} \Big\}.$$

The Plünecke inequality (see, [19, Theorem 7.7]) together with the condition $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|$ implies that $|\mathcal{U}^{(m)}| < 10^m|\mathcal{U}|$. Thus, using Lemma 2, we derive that

$$|\mathcal{J}_d^{(m)}| \ll \sum_{r \in \mathcal{U}^{(m)}} \left(1 + \frac{(H/d)^{2m}}{p}\right) \ll |\mathcal{U}| \left(1 + \frac{(H/d)^{2m}}{p}\right),$$

the implied constant may depend on m. On the other hand Lemma 1 implies that $|\mathcal{J}_d^{(m)}| \gtrsim |\mathcal{J}_d|^m$. Thus,

$$J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}) = |\mathcal{J}_d| \lesssim |\mathcal{U}|^{1/m} + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/m} H^2}{p^{1/m} d^2}. \tag{8}$$

We first prove the part (i) of our theorem. It suffices to prove that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $c = c(\delta) > 0$ such that $J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}) < (H/d)p^{\delta}$. In particular, since $J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}) \le (H/d)^2$, we can assume that $H/d > p^{\delta}$. Let m be the smallest positive integer such that $|\mathcal{U}| < (H/d)^m$. Clearly, $m < 1 + 1/\delta$. It is easy to see that $(H/d)^m < p/|\mathcal{U}|$. Indeed, if $(H/d)^m \ge p/|\mathcal{U}|$, then from the condition of the theorem it follows that $m \ge n + 1$. On the other hand, by the definition of m we have $(H/d)^{m-1} \le |\mathcal{U}|$. Hence, the lower and the upper bounds for H/d give

$$|\mathcal{U}| \ge p^{(m-1)/(2m-1)} \ge p^{n/(2n+1)},$$

which contradicts the condition of the theorem.

Thus, we have

$$|\mathcal{U}| < (H/d)^m < p/|\mathcal{U}|.$$

Combining this with (8), we get that

$$J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}) \lesssim \frac{H}{d},$$

which, in view of the remark above, finishes the proof of the part (i) of the theorem.

Now we prove the part (ii) of the theorem. In the inequality (7) we split the summation over $d < H$ into at most $H^{o(1)}$ dyadic intervals of the form $[H/2^j, H/2^{j-1}]$. It then follows from (7) that for some $1 \le L \le H$ one has

$$J \lesssim \sum_{H/(2L) \le d \le H/L} J_1(H/d, \mathcal{U}).$$

Using (8) we get that for any fixed positive integer constant m we have the bound

$$J \lesssim H\Big(\frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/m}}{L} + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/m}L}{p^{1/m}}\Big). \tag{9}$$

We can assume that $L > p^{\delta}$ for some small positive constant $\delta > 0$, as otherwise, the result follows from (9) for a sufficiently large constant m.

If $L \geq |\mathcal{U}|$, then applying (9) with $m = 1$ and using $L \leq H$ we obtain that

$$J \lesssim H + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|H^2}{p}.$$

Thus in this case we get the desired estimate. So, in what follows, we assume that $L \leq |\mathcal{U}|$. Consider two cases.

Case 1. $|\mathcal{U}|^{1/2} \leq L \leq |\mathcal{U}|$. Since we also have $L \leq H$, taking $m = 1$ we get

$$J \lesssim \frac{H|\mathcal{U}|}{L} + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|H^2}{p}.$$

Now take $m = 2$ in (9) and get

$$J \lesssim H + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/2}HL}{p^{1/2}}.$$

Putting the last two inequalities together, we obtain that

$$J \lesssim H + \frac{|\mathcal{U}|H^2}{p} + \min\Big\{\frac{H|\mathcal{U}|}{L}, \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/2}HL}{p^{1/2}}\Big\}.$$

Since

$$\min\Big\{\frac{H|\mathcal{U}|}{L}, \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/2}HL}{p^{1/2}}\Big\} \leq \frac{H|\mathcal{U}|^{3/4}}{p^{1/4}},$$

the result follows in this case.

Case 2. $|\mathcal{U}|^{1/(n+1)} \leq L \leq |\mathcal{U}|^{1/n}$ for some integer $n \geq 2$. Since $L > p^{\delta}$ for some positive constant δ, we get that $n \leq n_0$ for some integer constant n_0. We apply the bound (9) with $m = n + 1$ and obtain

$$J \lesssim H + \frac{H|\mathcal{U}|^{(2n+1)/n(n+1)}}{p^{1/(n+1)}}.$$

Since $n \geq 2$ and $|\mathcal{U}| < p^{2/5}$ we get

$$|\mathcal{U}|^{(2n+1)/n} \leq p.$$

Therefore, we obtain $J \lesssim H$ and finish the proof of our theorem.

To derive Corollary 1, we fix $r = r_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$J \le |\mathcal{U}| J',$$

where J' is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x \equiv x_1 r_0^{-1} r_1 \pmod p; \quad 1 \le x, x_1 \le H, \quad r_1 \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Now we simply denote

$$\mathcal{U}' = \{r_0^{-1} r_1; \quad r_1 \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

and apply Theorem 1 with $\mathcal{U}$ substituted by $\mathcal{U}'$.

4 Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 2

We can assume that $\lambda \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$. Denote $N = \lfloor p/d \rfloor$. If $d_1 = (d, p-1)$, then the congruence (3) becomes equivalent to a congruence of the form

$$x^{d_1} \equiv \lambda_1 \pmod p; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad L+1 \le x \le L+N,$$

for some $\lambda_1 \not\equiv 0 (\mathrm{mod} p)$, and we have $d_1 | p-1$ and $N_1 = \lfloor p/d_1 \rfloor \ge N$. Thus, without loss of generality we can assume that $d | p-1$. We can also assume that

$$p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.001} < d < p^{\frac{2}{3}+0.001}, \tag{10}$$

as otherwise the claim would follow from the trivial bound $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) \le \min\{d, N\}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}_d$ be the subgroup of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ of order d. We fix one solution $x = x_0$ to (3). Clearly, $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N)$ is equal to the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x (\mathrm{mod} p) \in x_0 \mathcal{G}_d, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad L+1 \le x \le L+N.$$

In view of (10), we have

$$d \in [p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.001}, p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}] \cup [p^{\frac{2}{3}-0.001}, p^{\frac{2}{3}+0.001}] \cup [p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}, p^{\frac{2}{3}-0.001}].$$

Accordingly, we consider three cases.

Case 1. $p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.001} < d < p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}$. In this case we express $T_p(d, \lambda, L, N)$ in terms of exponential sums and obtain

$$T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{a=0}^{p} \sum_{u \in x_0 \mathcal{G}_d} \sum_{L+1 \le x \le L+N} e_p(a(u-x)).$$

We separate the term corresponding to $a = 0$ and using the standard arguments and Lemma 6, we obtain

$$T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) \ll \frac{dN}{p} + d^{29/36} p^{1/18} \Big(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{a=1}^{p-1} \Big| \sum_{L+1 \le x \le L+N} e_p(ax) \Big| \Big). \tag{11}$$

We recall the well-known elementary bound

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{a=1}^{p-1} \Big| \sum_{L+1 \le x \le L+N} e_p(ax) \Big| \ll \log p,$$

see, for example, the solution to the exercise 11 of Chapter 3 in the book of Vinogradov [23]. Substituting this in (11), we obtain that

$$T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) \lesssim d^{29/36} p^{1/18}.$$

Since $d < p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}$, we get $d^{29/36} p^{1/18} < p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.001}$ and the result follows in this case.

Case 2. $p^{\frac{2}{3}-0.001} < d < p^{\frac{2}{3}+0.001}$. In this case we denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the set of integers $x \in [L+1, L+N]$ for which $x (\mathrm{mod} p) \in x_0 \mathcal{G}_d$. Then

$$T_p(d, \lambda, L, N) = |\mathcal{T}|. \tag{12}$$

Clearly, if $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \mathcal{T}$, we get that $x_1 \cdots x_m (\mathrm{mod} p) \in x_0^m \mathcal{G}_d$. Thus, $|\mathcal{T}|^m$ is not greater, than the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x_1 \cdots x_m (\mathrm{mod} p) \in x_0^m \mathcal{G}_d, \quad L+1 \le x_i \le L+N.$$

Therefore, for some fixed $\lambda_0 \in x_0^m \mathcal{G}_d$ we have

$$|\mathcal{T}|^m < dR, \tag{13}$$

where R is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x_1 \cdots x_m \equiv \lambda_0 (\mathrm{mod} p), \quad L+1 \le x_i \le L+N.$$

We express R in terms of character sums and obtain that

$$R = \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{\chi}\Big(\sum_{L+1\le x\le L+N}\chi(x)\Big)^m\chi(\lambda_0^{-1}),$$

where χ runs through the set of characters modulo p. Separating the term that corresponds to the principal character χ_0, we get that

$$R \le \frac{N^m}{p-1} + \max_{\chi\neq\chi_o}\Big|\sum_{L+1\le x\le L+N}\chi(x)\Big|^m.$$

We apply Lemma 5 with $r=5$. Since $N > 0.5p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.001}$, it follows that

$$\max_{\chi\neq\chi_o}\Big|\sum_{L+1\le x\le L+N}\chi(x)\Big| \ll N^{59/60}.$$

Hence, taking $m=200$, we get

$$R \ll \frac{N^{200}}{p} + \frac{N^{200}}{N^{10/3}} \ll \frac{N^{200}}{p}.$$

Therefore, from (13) we obtain that

$$|\mathcal{T}| \ll (dR)^{1/200} \le N\Big(\frac{d}{p}\Big)^{1/200} \le \Big(\frac{p}{d}\Big)^{199/200} < p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.0001}.$$

Hence, substituting this in (12), we get the desired estimate.

Case 3. $p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001} < d < p^{\frac{2}{3}-0.001}$. In particular, we get

$$N = \lfloor p/d\rfloor \gg p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}.$$

We apply Lemma 4 with

$$\{\gamma_n\}_n = \Big\{\frac{x_0h}{p};\, h\in\mathcal{G}_d\Big\},\quad \alpha = \frac{L+1}{p},\quad \beta = \frac{L+N}{p},\quad K = d.$$

It follows that

$$T_p(d,\lambda,L,N) \ll 1 + \frac{1}{d}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\Big|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d}e_p(kx_0h)\Big|. \tag{14}$$

Since $\mathcal{G}_d$ is cyclic (and therefore consists of all powers of some element) and $d > p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}$, there exists a subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}_d$ such that

$$0.1p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001} < |\mathcal{U}| < 0.2p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001}, \quad |\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| \le 2|\mathcal{U}|.$$

Clearly, $r\mathcal{G}_d = \mathcal{G}_d$ for any $r \in \mathcal{U}$. It then follows that

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(kx_0h)\right| = \frac{1}{d|\mathcal{U}|}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{r\in\mathcal{U}}\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(krx_0h)\right|. \tag{15}$$

Let $I(\mu)$ be the number of solutions of the congruence

$$kr \equiv \mu \pmod p, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k \le d, \quad r \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Note that, by Corollary 1, we have

$$\sum_{\mu=0}^{p-1} I(\mu)^2 \lesssim \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{7/4}d}{p^{1/4}}. \tag{16}$$

Indeed, the left hand side is equal to the number of solutions of the congruence

$$kr \equiv k_1r_1 \pmod p, \quad k, k_1 \in \mathbb{N}; \quad k, k_1 \le d; \quad r, r_1 \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Moreover,

$$p^{1/3} < |\mathcal{U}| < p^{2/5}, \quad |\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| < 10|\mathcal{U}|, \quad |\mathcal{U}|d < p^{\frac{2}{3}-0.001}p^{\frac{1}{3}+0.001} = p.$$

Thus, we are at the condition of (ii) of Corollary 1. Therefore, the estimate (16) holds.

Now, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\sum_{r\in\mathcal{U}}\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(krx_0h)\right| &= \sum_{\mu=0}^{p-1} I(\mu)\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(\mu x_0h)\right| \\ &\le \Big(\sum_{\mu=0}^{p-1} I(\mu)^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{\mu=0}^{p-1}\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(\mu x_0h)\right|^2\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|\mathcal{U}|^{7/8}d^{1/2}}{p^{1/8}}(pd)^{1/2} = |\mathcal{U}|^{7/8}dp^{3/8}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this in (15), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\left|\sum_{h\in\mathcal{G}_d} e_p(kx_0h)\right| \lesssim \frac{p^{3/8}}{|\mathcal{U}|^{1/8}} \lesssim p^{\frac{1}{3}-0.0001}.$$

This together with (14) proves Theorem 2.

We shall now derive Corollary 2. Let J be the number of solutions of (4). Clearly, if $\gcd(f(x), p-1) = d$, then (4) implies that $x^d \equiv 1 \pmod p$. Hence,

$$J = \sum_{d|p-1} J_d, \tag{17}$$

where J_d is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x^d \equiv 1 \pmod p; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x < p, \quad \gcd(f(x), p-1) = d.$$

Since $f(x)$ does not have multiple roots, by the Nagell-Ore theorem (see [14], even for a stronger form) the set of x with $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod d$ consists on the union of arithmetic progressions of the form $x \equiv k \pmod d$ for at most $d^{o(1)}$ different values of k. Thus, for each $d|p-1$ there exists a non-negative integer $k_0 < d$ such that

$$J_d \lesssim J'_d, \tag{18}$$

where J'_d is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x^d \equiv 1 \pmod p; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x < p, \quad x \equiv k_0 \pmod d.$$

Representing $x = k_0 + dy$, we get the congruence

$$(k_0 + dy)^d \equiv 1 \pmod p; \quad y \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad y < p/d.$$

Hence, if we denote by d_1 the multiplicative inverse of $d \pmod p$, we get that J'_d is not greater than the number of solutions of the congruence

$$(y + k_0 d_1)^d \equiv d_1^d \pmod p; \quad y \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad y < p/d.$$

According to Theorem 2, we have $J'_d \lesssim p^{\frac{1}{3}-c}$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$. Combining this bound with (18) and (17), we conclude the proof.

5 Proof of Theorem 3

We first establish the following statement, based on Corollary 1.

Lemma 7. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 0.01$ be fixed, $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be such that* $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| \le 10|\mathcal{U}|$ *and*

$$H = \lfloor p^{1/4+\varepsilon} \rfloor, \quad 2H < |\mathcal{U}| \le p^{3/8-0.5\varepsilon}.$$

Then the number T of solutions of the congruence

$$qxr \equiv q_1 x_1 r_1 \pmod p \tag{19}$$

in positive integers x, x_1, prime numbers q, q_1 and elements $r, r_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ with

$$x, x_1 \le H, \quad 0.5|\mathcal{U}| < q, q_1 \le |\mathcal{U}| \tag{20}$$

satisfies

$$T \lesssim |\mathcal{U}|^2 H.$$

Proof. We have

$$T = T_1 + T_2,$$

where T_1 is the number of solutions of (19) satisfying (20) with the additional condition $q = q_1$, and T_2 is the number of solutions with $q \ne q_1$. We observe that $|\mathcal{U}| < p^{3/8} < p^{2/5}$ and

$$|\mathcal{U}|H^2 < p^{3/8-0.5\epsilon} p^{1/2+2\epsilon} < p^{7/8+3\epsilon/2} < p.$$

Thus, we can apply Corollary 1 with $n = 2$ and get

$$T_1 \lesssim |\mathcal{U}|^2 H.$$

In order to estimate T_2, we fix x_1, r, r_1 such that

$$T_2 \le |\mathcal{U}|^2 H T_2',$$

where T_2' is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$\frac{qx}{q_1} \equiv \frac{x_1 r_1}{r} \pmod p$$

in positive integers $x \le H$ and prime numbers q, q_1 with

$$q \ne q_1, \quad 0.5|\mathcal{U}| < q, q_1 \le |\mathcal{U}|.$$

From $x \le H < q_1$, it follows that $\gcd(qx, q_1) = 1$. Since $H|\mathcal{U}|^2 < p$, from Lemma 3 we get that xq and q_1 are uniquely determined. Since $x < q$, the value xq uniquely determines x and q. Hence, $T_2' \le 1$, whence $T_2 \le |\mathcal{U}|^2 H$ concluding the proof of our lemma.

□

We now proceed to prove Theorem 3. Assuming $\varepsilon < 0.01$, we define

$$m_0 = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil, \quad L = \lfloor p^{1/m_0} \rfloor, \quad H = \lfloor p^{1/4+\varepsilon} \rfloor, \quad N = \lfloor p^{3/8-0.5\varepsilon} \rfloor.$$

From Lemma 5 it follows that there exists $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any non-principal character χ modulo p the following bound holds:

$$\left| \sum_{x \le H} \chi(x) \right| \le H^{1-\delta}. \tag{21}$$

Let $\mathcal{G}'$ be a subset of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $|\mathcal{G}'| = N$ and $|\mathcal{G}'\mathcal{G}'| \le 2|\mathcal{G}'|$. The existence of such a subset is obvious, since either $\mathcal{G}$ consists on consecutive powers of a primitive root or it is a subgroup of $\mathbb{F}_p^*$, which is cyclic.

It suffices to prove that for some $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ there are $p + O(p^{1-\delta_0})$ residue classes modulo p of the form $zxqr \pmod p$, with positive integers x, z, prime numbers q and elements r satisfying

$$z \le L, \quad x \le H, \quad \frac{N}{2} < q \le N, \quad r \in \mathcal{G}'.$$

Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be the exceptional set, that is, assume that the congruence

$$zxqr \equiv \lambda \pmod p$$

has no solutions in $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and z, x, q, r as above. We write this condition in the form of character sums

$$\frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{\chi} \sum_{z \le L} \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{0.5N < q < N \\ q \text{ is prime}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(zxqr\lambda^{-1}) = 0,$$

where χ runs through the set of characters modulo p. Separating the term corresponding to the principal character $\chi = \chi_0$, we get

$$LHN^2|\Lambda| \lesssim \sum_{\chi \ne \chi_0} \Big| \sum_{z \le L} \chi(z) \Big| \Big| \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{0.5N < q < N \\ q \text{ is prime}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \chi(xqr) \Big| \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(\lambda) \Big|.$$

Following [8, 9], we split the set of nonprincipal characters χ into two subsets $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ as follows. To the set $\mathcal{X}_1$ we allot those characters χ, for which

$$\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big| \ge L^{1-0.1\delta},$$

where δ is defined from (21). The remaining characters we include to the set $\mathcal{X}_2$, these are the characters that satisfy

$$\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big| < L^{1-0.1\delta}.$$

Thus, we have

$$LHN^2|\Lambda| \lesssim W_1 + W_2, \tag{22}$$

where

$$W_i = \sum_{\chi\in\mathcal{X}_i}\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big|\Big|\sum_{x\le H}\sum_{\substack{0.5N<q<N\\ q \text{ is prime}}}\sum_{r\in\mathcal{G}'}\chi(xqr)\Big|\Big|\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\chi(\lambda)\Big|.$$

To deal with W_1, we show that the cardinality of $\mathcal{X}_1$ is small. We have

$$|\mathcal{X}_1|L^{2m_0(1-0.1\delta)} \le \sum_{\chi\in\mathcal{X}_1}\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big|^{2m_0} \le \sum_{\chi}\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big|^{2m_0} = (p-1)T,$$

where T is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x_1\cdots x_{m_0} \equiv y_1\cdots y_{m_0} \pmod p; \quad x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{N}; \quad x_i, y_j \le L.$$

Since $L^{m_0} < p$, the congruence is converted to an equality and we have, by the estimate for the divisor function, at most $L^{m_0+o(1)}$ solutions. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{X}_1|L^{2m_0(1-0.1\delta)} \lesssim pL^{m_0+o(1)},$$

whence, in view of $L^{m_0} = p^{1+o(1)}$, we get

$$|\mathcal{X}_1| \lesssim p^{0.2\delta}.$$

Thus, estimating in W_1 the sums over z, q, r, λ trivially and applying (21) to the sum over x, we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \sum_{\chi\in\mathcal{X}_1}\Big|\sum_{z\le L}\chi(z)\Big|\Big|\sum_{x\le H}\chi(x)\Big|\Big|\sum_{\substack{0.5N<q<N\\ q \text{ is prime}}}\sum_{r\in\mathcal{G}'}\chi(qr)\Big|\Big|\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\chi(\lambda)\Big| \\ &\lesssim |\mathcal{X}_1|\cdot L\cdot N^2\cdot|\Lambda|\max_{\chi\ne\chi_0}\Big|\sum_{x\le H}\chi(x)\Big| \lesssim p^{0.2\delta}LN^2|\Lambda|H^{1-\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $H > p^{1/4}$ we have, for sufficiently large p, the estimate

$$W_1 < LHN^2|\Lambda|p^{-0.01\delta}.$$

Inserting this bound into (22), we get

$$LHN^2|\Lambda| \lesssim W_2. \tag{23}$$

We next estimate W_2. By the definition of $\mathcal{X}_2$, we have

$$W_2 \le L^{1-0.1\delta} \sum_{\chi} \Big| \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{0.5N<q<N \\ q \text{ is prime}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \chi(xqr) \Big| \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(\lambda) \Big|. \tag{24}$$

Next, we have

$$\sum_{\chi} \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(\lambda) \Big|^2 = (p-1)|\Lambda|$$

and

$$\sum_{\chi} \Big| \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{0.5N<q<N \\ q \text{ is prime}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \chi(xqr) \Big|^2 = (p-1)T,$$

where T is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$xqr \equiv x_1 q_1 r_1 \pmod{p},$$

in positive integers x, x_1 prime numbers q, q_1 and elements $r, r_1 \in \mathcal{G}'$ satisfying

$$x_1, x_2 \le H, \quad 0.5N < q, q_1 < N, \quad r, r_1 \in \mathcal{G}'.$$

From Lemma 7 with $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{G}'$ it follows that

$$T \lesssim N^2 H.$$

Therefore, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in (24), and using (23), we obtain that

$$L^2 H^2 N^4 |\Lambda|^2 \lesssim W_2^2 \lesssim L^{2-0.02\delta}(p-1)^2|\Lambda|T \lesssim L^{2-0.02\delta} p^2 |\Lambda| N^2 H.$$

Thus,

$$|\Lambda| \lesssim \frac{p^2 L^{-0.02\delta}}{HN^2} \lesssim pL^{-0.02\delta}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\Lambda| < p^{1-\delta_0}$$

for some $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon)$, which concludes the proof.

6 Proof of Theorem 4

The proof follows the same line as the proof of Theorem 3, however, instead of Lemma 7 we shall use Lemma 8 .

Lemma 8. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 0.01$ be fixed, $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be such that $|\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathcal{U}| \le 10|\mathcal{U}|$ and*

$$H = \lfloor p^{1/4+\varepsilon} \rfloor, \quad Q = \lfloor p^{1/4} \rfloor, \quad |\mathcal{U}| \le p^{1/4-\varepsilon}.$$

Then the number T of solutions of the congruence

$$q_1 q_2 x r \equiv q_1' q_2' x' r' \pmod p \tag{25}$$

in positive integers x, x', prime numbers q_1, q_2, q_1', q_2' and elements $r, r' \in \mathcal{U}$ with

$$x, x' \le H, \quad \frac{Q}{4} < q_1, q_1' < \frac{Q}{2}, \quad \frac{Q}{2} < q_2, q_2' < Q, \tag{26}$$

satisfies

$$T \lesssim Q^2 H |\mathcal{U}|.$$

Let us prove the lemma. We have

$$T = T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4, \tag{27}$$

where T_1 is the number of solutions of (25) satisfying (26) and with the additional condition $q_1 = q_2$, $q_1' = q_2'$, T_2 is the number of solutions with $q_1 \ne q_1'$, $q_2 \ne q_2'$, T_3 is the number of solutions with $q_1 = q_1'$, $q_2 \ne q_2'$ and T_4 is the number of solutions with $q_1 \ne q_1'$, $q_2 = q_2'$.

We have $T_1 \le Q^2 T_1'$, where T_1' is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$x r \equiv x' r' \pmod p; \quad x, x' \le H, \quad r, r' \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Applying Corollary 1 with $n = 1$ or $n = 2$, we get that $T_1' \lesssim |\mathcal{U}| H$. Therefore,

$$T_1 \lesssim Q^2 H |\mathcal{U}|. \tag{28}$$

To estimate T_2, we fix x, r, x', r' and see that

$$T_2 \lesssim |\mathcal{U}|^2 |H|^2 T_2',$$

where T_2' is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$\frac{q_1 q_2}{q_1' q_2'} \equiv \frac{x' r'}{x r} \pmod p$$

in prime numbers q_1, q_1', q_2, q_2' with

$$\frac{Q}{4} < q_1, q_1' < \frac{Q}{2}, \quad \frac{Q}{2} < q_2, q_2' < Q, \quad q_1 \neq q_1', \quad q_2 \neq q_2'.$$

Since $\gcd(q_1q_2, q_1'q_2') = 1$ and $Q^4 < p$, it follows from Lemma 3 that the numbers q_1q_2 and $q_1'q_2'$ are uniquely determined. Since $q_1 < q_2$ and $q_1' < q_2'$, this implies that in fact all the prime numbers q_1, q_2, q_1', q_2' are uniquely determined. Therefore, $T_2' \leq 1$ and we get

$$T_2 \lesssim |\mathcal{U}|^2|H|^2 \lesssim Q^2H|\mathcal{U}|. \tag{29}$$

In order to estimate T_3 and T_4, we note that

$$T_3 + T_4 \leq QT_5,$$

where T_5 is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$qxr \equiv q'x'r' \pmod{p},$$

in positive integers x, x', prime numbers q, q' and elements $r, r' \in \mathcal{U}$ with

$$x, x' \leq H, \quad \frac{Q}{4} < q, q' < Q, \quad q \neq q'.$$

We introduce variables x_1, x_2 with

$$x_1 = qx, \quad x_2 = q'x'$$

and note that

$$x_1r \equiv x_2r' \pmod{p}; \quad x_1, x_2 \leq QH, \quad r, r' \in \mathcal{U}.$$

We can apply Corollary 1 with $n = 1$ and H substituted by QH (clearly, the conditions of Corollary 1 are satisfied). It then follows that there are at most $QH|\mathcal{U}|p^{o(1)}$ possibilities for the quadruple (x_1, x_2, r, r'). Each such quadruple determines q, x, q', x' with at most $p^{o(1)}$ possibilities, because q, x, q', x' are divisors of $x_1x_2 < p$. Therefore, we get that

$$T_5 \lesssim QH|\mathcal{U}|,$$

implying that

$$T_3 + T_4 \lesssim Q^2H|\mathcal{U}|.$$

Inserting this estimate together with (28) and (29) into (27), we conclude the proof of our lemma.

Now we proceed to prove Theorem 4. Assuming $\varepsilon < 0.01$, we define

$$m_0 = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil, \quad L = \lfloor p^{1/m_0} \rfloor, \quad H = \lfloor p^{1/4+\varepsilon} \rfloor, \quad Q = \lfloor p^{1/4} \rfloor, \quad N = \lfloor p^{1/4-\varepsilon} \rfloor.$$

Following the proof of Theorem 3, we denote by $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ a positive constant such that for any non-principal character χ modulo p the following bound holds:

$$\left| \sum_{x \le H} \chi(x) \right| \le H^{1-\delta}. \tag{30}$$

We again let $\mathcal{G}'$ be a subset of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $|\mathcal{G}'| = N$ and $|\mathcal{G}'\mathcal{G}'| \le 2|\mathcal{G}'|$.

It suffices to prove that for some $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ there are $p + O(p^{1-\delta_0})$ residue classes modulo p of the form $zxq_1q_2r \pmod p$, with positive integers z, x, prime numbers q_1, q_2 and elements r satisfying

$$z \le L, \quad x \le H, \quad \frac{Q}{4} < q_1 \le \frac{Q}{2}, \quad \frac{Q}{2} < q_2 \le Q, \quad r \in \mathcal{G}'.$$

Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be the exceptional set, that is, assume that the congruence

$$zxq_1q_2r \equiv \lambda \pmod p$$

has no solutions in $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and z, x, q_1, q_2, r as above. Following the proof of Theorem 3, we derive that

$$LHQ^2N|\Lambda| \lesssim \sum_{\chi \ne \chi_0} \Big| \sum_{z \le L} \chi(z) \Big| \Big| \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{Q/4 < q_1 < Q/2 \\ Q/2 < q_2 < Q \\ q_1, q_2 \text{ are primes}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \chi(xq_1q_2r) \Big| \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(\lambda) \Big|.$$

We define the set of characters $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ exactly the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4 and write

$$LHQ^2N|\Lambda| \lesssim W_1 + W_2, \tag{31}$$

where

$$W_i = \sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{X}_i} \Big| \sum_{z \le L} \chi(z) \Big| \Big| \sum_{x \le H} \sum_{\substack{Q/4 < q_1 < Q/2 \\ Q/2 < q_2 < Q \\ q_1, q_2 \text{ are primes}}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{G}'} \chi(xq_1q_2r) \Big| \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi(\lambda) \Big|.$$

From the proof of Theorem 3 it follows that

$$|\mathcal{X}_1| \lesssim p^{0.2\delta}.$$

Thus, estimating in W_1 the sums over z, q_1, q_2, r, λ trivially and applying (30) to the sum over x, we get

$$W_1 < LHQ^2N|\Lambda|p^{-0.01\delta}.$$

Inserting this bound into (31), we get

$$LHQ^2N|\Lambda| \lesssim W_2.$$

Following the argument of the proof of Theorem 3 we have

$$L^2H^2Q^4N^2|\Lambda|^2 \lesssim W_2^2 \lesssim L^{2-0.02\delta}(p-1)^2|\Lambda|T,$$

where T is the number of solutions of the congruence

$$xq_1q_2r \equiv x'q_1'q_2'r' \pmod{p},$$

in positive integers x, x' prime numbers q_1, q_2, q_1', q_2' and elements $r, r_1 \in \mathcal{G}'$ satisfying

$$x_1, x_2 \le H, \quad \frac{Q}{4} < q_1, q_1' < \frac{Q}{2}, \quad \frac{Q}{2} < q_1, q_1' < Q, \quad r, r_1 \in \mathcal{G}'.$$

From Lemma 8 with $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{G}'$ it follows that

$$T \lesssim HQ^2N.$$

Therefore,

$$L^2H^2Q^4N^2|\Lambda|^2 \lesssim L^{2-0.02\delta}p^2HQ^2|\Lambda|.$$

Thus,

$$|\Lambda| \lesssim \frac{p^2}{HQ^2N}L^{-0.02\delta},$$

whence

$$|\Lambda| < p^{1-\delta_0}$$

for some $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.

References

[1] A. Balog, K. A. Broughan and I. E. Shparlinski, 'On the number of solutions of exponential congruences', *Acta Arith.*, **148** (2011), 93–103.

[2] U. Betke, M. Henk and J. M. Wills, 'Successive-minima-type inequalities', *Discr. Comput. Geom.*, **9** (1993), 165–175.

[3] J. Bourgain, S. V. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski, 'Product sets of rationals, multiplicative translates of subgroups in residue rings, and fixed points of the discrete logarithm', *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2008), Art. ID rnn 090, 29 pp.

[4] J. Bourgain, M. Z. Garaev, S. V. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski, 'On congruences with products of variables from short intervals and applications', *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **280** (2013), 61–90.

[5] D. A. Burgess, 'On character sums and L-series', *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **12** (1962), 193-206.

[6] D. A. Burgess, 'On character sums and L-series. II.', *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **13** (1963), 524-536.

[7] J. Cilleruelo, 'A note on product sets of fractions', Preprint.

[8] J. Cilleruelo and M. Z. Garaev, 'Least totients in arithmetic progressions', *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **137** (2009), 2913–2919.

[9] M. Z. Garaev, 'A note on the least totient of a residue class', *Quart. J. Math.*, **60** (2009), 53–56.

[10] M. Z. Garaev, 'On multiplicative congruences', *Math. Zeitschrift.*, **272** (2012), 473–482.

[11] M. Z. Garaev and A. A. Karatsuba, 'On character sums and the exceptional set of a congruence problema ', *J. Number Theory*, **114** (2005), 182–192.

[12] M. Z. Garaev and A. A. Karatsuba, 'The representation of residue classes by products of small integers', *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.*, **50** (2007), 363–375.

[13] D. R. Heath-Brown, 'The divisor function $d_3(n)$ in an arithmetic progressions', *Acta Arith.*, **47** (1986), 29–56.

[14] M. N. Huxley, 'A note on polynomial congruences', *Recent progress in analytic number theory*, Vol. 1 (Durham, 1979), Academic Press, London-New York, 1981, 193-196.

[15] S. V. Konyagin, 'Estimates for trigonometric sums over subgroups and for Gauss sums', (Russian) IV International Conference 'Modern Problems of Number Theory and its Applications': Part III (2002), 86-114.

[16] S. V. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski, *Character sums with exponential functions and their applications*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[17] P. Kurlberg, F. Luca and I. E. Shparlinski, 'On the fixed points of the map $x \to x^x$ modulo a prime', *Math. Res. Letters*, (to appear).

[18] H. L. Montgomery, *Ten lectures on the interface between analytic number theory and harmonic analysis*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[19] M. B. Nathanson, *Additive number theory. Inverse problems and the geometry of sumsets,* Grad. Texts in Math., Vol 165, Springer-Verlag, New York 1996, 293 pp.

[20] I. Shkredov, 'Some new inequalities in additive combinatorics', Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory, **3** (2011), 237–288.

[21] Yu. N. Shteinokov,'Estimates of trigonometric sums modulo a prime', *Preprint*, 2014.

[22] I. M. Vinogradov, On the distribution of indices, *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **20** (1926), 73-76 (in Russian).

[23] I. M. Vinogradov, "An introduction to the theory of numbers", Pergamon Press, London & New York, 1955.

Address of the authors:

J. Cilleruelo, Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas (CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM) and Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid-28049, Spain.

Email:franciscojavier.cilleruelo@uam.es.

M. Z. Garaev, Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, C.P. 58089, Morelia, Michoacán, México,

Email:garaev@matmor.unam.mx